

uyFriday, May 4, 12

c-II/Crazy actions, expectations

(See my Notes on Fursenko and Naftali, Sept. 18, 2011)

--F&N (Fursenko and Naftali): 211; Sov planners think they can use tac nucs to "complicate" a US landing on Cuba, without esc!

--212: MinDef delegates to Pliyev authority to use tac nucs (oral delegation signed off by K on Sept. 7—after JFK warning!—and remains in force till Oct. 22 (Gribkov)

--There are gambles, there are long-shots, and there are crazy gambles and long-shots. It looked crazy to ExComm and others that K would attempt effort: because an **illegal** and dangerous response by the US was likely.

It was **not** "crazy" to suppose that JFK would not attack once the missiles were operational with warheads (and, too late to blockade).

It was **not** crazy (though most Americans didn't imagine it, afterwards) to conjecture, or hope, that JFK would not reveal the presence of the missiles if he discovered them before the election (before they were all there and operational), if he could prevent a leak;

**Or** that he could prevent a leak, for some days;

Though it was far from certain; a middling possibility, perhaps a long shot (NOT impossible); K may have hoped for this or even counted on it (somewhat unreasonably but not crazily), though there is no direct evidence of this. (My conjecture during my study)

--But: K persisted even after the warnings by JFK on Sept. 4 and 13. (He could have reconsidered sending warheads after Sept. 4; but then, he might as well have brought back MBMS then. But there had been a BIG, unprecedented investment by then; he goes ahead, on K/T principles; rather than a sure (domestic) loss in prestige, gamble...A good case of K/T gambling with catastrophe (my model)(can I attribute this model to my crisis study? It really derives in part from VN, K/T's work, and Challenger, all later than 1964! It's a good case: K's fear of imminent loss of Cuba, and then of imminent loss of stature with exposure by drawing back from huge investment vs. attempt to win, at risk of disaster.

[Like JFK's postponement of his willingness to trade missiles, gambling—for a day—on possibility of winning (without probably realizing what risks he was taking of global catastrophe by postponing: just as K was postponing, on October 26-27.

This was not only a case of the “fait malaccompli” model, for K. Both exhibited the gambling-with-catastrophe model, which so often (almost always?) precedes actual catastrophe! Though not in this case—one of them won, the other suffered a political disaster but neither, ultimate global catastrophe—but the latter was more than possible. It was really a fairly likely outcome (not, perhaps, odds-on), given the two gambles (with JFK in ignorance of key elements, not aware of the extreme risks).

K’s unique **awareness**--given his “crazy” choices of sending the nucs and warheads at all, without informing JFK (where even a bluff, on both, would have been sufficient to win: this did **not** have to be beyond reasonable doubt!)—made him the candidate who in the end-game “had” to give in first.

With JFK—not because he was cowardly but because he was reasonable, not mad—US conventional superiority in the Caribbean and nuclear superiority globally (real—except for Europe!) did **not** guarantee success, or avoidance of disaster, or even make it very likely and unrisky (contrary to the hawks, and many later analysts).

It took **luck** (and Khrushchev’s lack of madness, in the end, having made mad earlier choices; and K’s lack of control of Castro, who **was** “mad,” in a not-unusual way for young male nationalists, a “suicide bomber”) for both to avoid catastrophe, and for JFK to win.

(When **disaster** is “highly possible,” even if less likely than not, avoidance of it can be said to be “lucky” even if it is more likely than not, or not unlikely.)

K seems to have had no “exit” plan (who ever does?): no plan B for what to do if JFK announces the deployment before it is operational, and threatens—or, inevitably, is pressed to threaten—attack and/or blockade. “What if secrecy fails”—too long before election for JFK to keep the secret? Keating indicated this was happening by August 10. (Perhaps JFK denials reassured K that either his own false assurances were working, or that JFK was complying with his implicit offer to postpone the revelation till after the election, aborting a “crisis” by mutual cooperation (as on the U-2, before Powers).

So he, too, warns and assures, to deter: yet he failed to prevent JFK from a commitment. (Both fail to deter). Having failed to deter JFK from the warnings, it was crazy to continue (he merely speeded up—to assure some missiles operational before the election, to assure that JFK would not reveal them? Or, to assure no invasion before election? That would be a reasonable concern, though it’s not clear that the Sovs held it.

Crazy unless: he took new steps to deter. He had a winning card: the tac nucs, with warheads; and the 40,000 Sov troops (when did they debark?) He could have revealed these as soon as they arrived—privately, to JFK, to allow him to climb



down from his commitment! Or publicly, to prevent pressure on JFK to carry out his warning. And he could go to the Security Council immediately, himself! (With indications of possible invasion of Cuba!) (He's not asking them to intervene, but to accept his lawful measures of defense of an ally, and to restrain the US! He could have preempted and reversed the tables on Stevenson!

Instead, he counted (I think) on JFK's cooperative silence. But this was unreasonable, after the October 14 U-2 flight! Or Keating's Oct. 10 speech which asserted White House "knowledge." ) He couldn't have hoped after that that JFK didn't know: or really, that he could keep it secret for several weeks! (HE didn't use that week—or 12 days-- well, if at all! His intelligence on the US was not very good! He didn't pick up what the US media did! What would he, what should he, have done if he had?

All in all, it was a reckless gamble, bordering on a long shot—**arguably crazy**, given the stakes (not just of backdown—which he seems not to have considered!—but of escalation).

Let me make that stronger: It **was** crazy (though it **could** have worked, against JFK: in fact, it came close, almost did work) to believe that (it was not "too" likely that) an American president would not discover the movement before it was a "fait accompli" and that he would not (be compelled to) take strong action, however illegal and dangerous.

It was on the order of (and closely related to) the **crazy** estimate of K's general that the missiles would not be discovered by overhead recon, without camouflage, among "the palm trees." (Discovery **was** close to certain, well before the election: especially given K's unexplained decision not to use the SAMs against the U-2, and not to delay installation of the missiles until the SAMs were operational).

I want to introduce the concept of "crazy, mad" choices—not all of which are meant to look mad!—as a category in analysis. As distinct from merely inadvertent, or poorly informed, or unreasoned, or non-optimal choices. There is not only the "political uses of (the appearance of) madness." There is "ordinary madness." (Not "clinical" in the individuals.)

Compare: C-I, the Bay of Pigs: the expectation of a general uprising in Cuba as a result of the Bay of Pigs was crazy (for those who held it: a different set, perhaps, from those who predicted it).

Or of low-cost, quickly successful invasion of Cuba (though this was before VN). No plan for guerrilla war, or sense of what that would mean (either in 1961 or 1962!)

JCS hope or belief that JFK would use US forces rather than lose, despite his verbal commitment to them (see LBJ in VN) was not crazy: it was even likely: but wrong. But that would have landed us in the soup (of VN) (although, on an island near us). JFK was not wrong, nor LBJ, in resisting.

Likewise, the expectation of assassination of Castro as a useful element; or of a fake attack on Guantanamo (or a Northwoods-type attack on a US ship: was that contemplated? Perhaps not, given the “provocation” expected of an impending defeat of the US-supported attackers without US intervention (as planned for Mongoose). Was not US intervention seen by the CIA as essential to success, as by EGL on Mongoose? JFK’s ruling that out should have aborted the plan; but they banked on his reversing himself: which he did not do in VN, or, in the end, in Cuba II. None of these were crazy expectations: but they were gambles, arguably long-shots; and they all lost.

It was the overall venture, relying on the first two beliefs, that was crazy (including the belief that it could be covert, with the US hand hidden or deniable).

General rule here: Something may look crazy; and probably is, if it looks that way; **yet** have calculations behind it, including some guesses and reasoning that are both esoteric and not entirely wrong or unrealistic, some unacknowledged motives that are “human,” not unusual, some not even discreditable, others discreditable but not uncommon; **yet** to discover these (perhaps long after the events) does not necessarily mean that the effort was not crazy, after all! Highly reasoned and motivated courses by generally reasonable people can be and often are, **crazy**! (See escalation in Vietnam in 1965! And Nixon’s strategy!)

This is not only for the public, voters, Congress to know, as a strong hypothesis. It is for the president to know, confronting allies and opponents! Not only “terrorists.” Of course, this possibility is asserted and exploited by those who want large “deterrent, retaliatory” forces; and who also want to use them for extended deterrence (counting on the opponents to know this about the US!)

Yet there are contradictions in their estimates: they assume that the opponent may be mad—yet deterrable (AJW: We want to make FS an act of madness for our opponent; yet we need forces for these that presume considerable madness in the opponent (a mere 20-40 million dead might not deter him: he’s almost Hitler, though Hitler probably could not have been deterred at all). Yet (JCS, not AJW): we want him to believe us mad, in NATO (or with FU threats elsewhere), and for him not to be mad enough to test that.

I am going to argue, of course, that the whole 67-year nuclear arms program has been crazy, despite enormous internal calculation on both sides (and hidden partial premises that “make some sense,” considered by themselves), crazy in many of its



premises and priorities leading to a continuously crazy result in terms of risks (both possible outcomes and likelihoods and uncertainties), ordinary madness of an extreme though not unprecedented sort, armed with unprecedented weapons foretelling an unprecedented and final outcome.

Ironically, some of the choices made by both JFK and K were less crazy than they appeared to be at the time (though some, unknown till much later, were even crazier, especially by K)—but the predicament they led to, the gambles they were making toward the end, were even worse, more reckless, more dangerous, than either of them knew at the time, nor any one else for 25 years (or later, with submarines; or now with my revelation on RFK).

Friday, May 4, 12

c-II/Crazy actions, expectations

(See my Notes on Fursenko and Naftali, Sept. 18, 2011)

--F&N (Fursenko and Naftali): 211; Sov planners think they can use tac nucs to "complicate" a US landing on Cuba, without esc!

--212: MinDef delegates to Pliyev authority to use tac nucs (oral delegation signed off by K on Sept. 7—after JFK warning!—and remains in force till Oct. 22 (Gribkov)

--There are gambles, there are long-shots, and there are crazy gambles and long-shots. It looked crazy to ExComm and others that K would attempt effort: because an **illegal** and dangerous response by the US was likely.

McN  
Fursenko

It was **not** "crazy" to suppose that JFK would not attack once the missiles were operational with warheads (and, too late to blockade).

It was **not** crazy (though most Americans didn't imagine it, afterwards) to conjecture, or hope, that JFK would not reveal the presence of the missiles if he discovered them before the election (before they were all there and operational), if he could prevent a leak;

**Or** that he could prevent a leak, for some days;

Though it was far from certain; a middling possibility, perhaps a long shot (NOT impossible); K may have hoped for this or even counted on it (somewhat unreasonably but not crazily), though there is no direct evidence of this. (My conjecture during my study)

11:30 AM  
3-19-15

\*

F.M.A.

K/T—

DPP

(Dolan  
Question)

--But: K persisted even after the warnings by JFK on Sept. 4 and 13. (He could have reconsidered sending warheads after Sept. 4; but then, he might as well have brought back MBMS then. But there had been a BIG, unprecedented investment by then; he goes ahead, on K/T principles; rather than a sure (domestic) loss in prestige, gamble... A good case of K/T gambling with catastrophe (my model) (can I attribute this model to my crisis study? It really derives in part from VN, K/T's work, and Challenger, all later than 1964! It's a good case: K's fear of imminent loss of Cuba, and then of imminent loss of stature with exposure by drawing back from huge investment vs. attempt to win, at risk of disaster.

(Like) JFK's postponement of his willingness to trade missiles, gambling—for a day—on possibility of winning (without probably realizing what risks he was taking of global catastrophe by postponing: just as K was postponing, on October 26-27.

webster  
he did, win

K/T = D.A.? (Dolan Question)



This was not only a case of the "fait accompli" model, for K. Both exhibited the gambling-with-catastrophe model, which so often (almost always?) precedes actual catastrophe! Though not in this case—one of them won, the other suffered a political disaster but neither, ultimate global catastrophe—but the latter was more than possible. It was really a fairly likely outcome (not, perhaps, odds-on), given the two gambles (with JFK in ignorance of key elements, not aware of the extreme risks).

*L-O-C (Castro!)  
Navy - American*

K's unique **awareness**--given his "crazy" choices of sending the nucs and warheads at all, without informing JFK (where even a bluff, on both, would have been sufficient to win: this did **not** have to be beyond reasonable doubt!)—made him the candidate who in the end-game "had" to give in first.

With JFK—not because he was cowardly but because he was reasonable, not mad—US conventional superiority in the Caribbean and nuclear superiority globally (real—except for Europe!) did **not** guarantee success, or avoidance of disaster, or even make it very likely and unrisky (contrary to the hawks, and many later analysts).

It took **luck** (and Khrushchev's lack of madness, in the end, having made mad earlier choices; and K's lack of control of Castro, who **was** "mad," in a not-unusual way for young male nationalists, a "suicide bomber") for both to avoid catastrophe, and for JFK to win.

(When **disaster** is "highly possible," even if less likely than not, avoidance of it can be said to be "lucky" even if it is more likely than not, or not unlikely.)

K seems to have had no "exit" plan (who ever does?): no plan B for what to do if JFK announces the deployment before it is operational, and threatens—or, inevitably, is pressed to threaten—attack and/or blockade. "What if secrecy fails"—too long before election for JFK to keep the secret? Keating indicated this was happening by August 10. (Perhaps JFK denials reassured K that either his own false assurances were working, or that JFK was complying with his implicit offer to postpone the revelation till after the election, aborting a "crisis" by mutual cooperation (as on the U-2, before Powers).

So he, too, warns and assures, to deter: yet he failed to prevent JFK from a commitment. (Both fail to deter). Having failed to deter JFK from the warnings, it was crazy to continue (he merely speeded up—to assure some missiles operational before the election, to assure that JFK would not reveal them? Or, to assure no invasion before election? That would be a reasonable concern, though it's not clear that the Sovs held it. *Now, I do believe 3-19-15*

Crazy unless: he took new steps to deter. He had a winning card: the tac nucs, with warheads; and the 40,000 Sov troops (when did they debark?) He could have revealed these as soon as they arrived—privately, to JFK, to allow him to climb



down from his commitment! Or publicly, to prevent pressure on JFK to carry out his warning. And he could go to the Security Council immediately, himself! (With indications of possible invasion of Cuba!) (He's not asking them to intervene, but to accept his lawful measures of defense of an ally, and to restrain the US! He could have preempted and reversed the tables on Stevenson!

Instead, he counted (I think) on JFK's cooperative silence. But this was unreasonable, after the October 14 U-2 flight! Or Keating's Oct. 10 speech which asserted White House "knowledge." ) He couldn't have hoped after that that JFK didn't know: or really, that he could keep it secret for several weeks! (HE didn't use that week—or 12 days-- well, if at all! His intelligence on the US was not very good! He didn't pick up what the US media did! What would he, what should he, have done if he had?

All in all, it was a reckless gamble, bordering on a long shot—**arguably crazy**, given the stakes (not just of backdown—which he seems not to have considered!—but of escalation).

UNLESS PLANNED RIGHT DIFFERENTLY

Let me make that stronger: It **was** crazy (though it **could** have worked, against JFK: in fact, it came close, almost did work) to believe that (it was not "too" likely that) an American president would not discover the movement before it was a "fait accompli" and that he would not (be compelled to) take strong action, however illegal and dangerous.

It was on the order of (and closely related to) the **crazy** estimate of K's general that the missiles would not be discovered by overhead recon, without camouflage, among "the palm trees." (Discovery **was** close to certain, well before the election: especially given K's unexplained decision not to use the SAMs against the U-2, and not to delay installation of the missiles until the SAMs were operational).

I want to introduce the concept of "crazy, mad" choices—not all of which are meant to look mad!—as a category in analysis. As distinct from merely inadvertent, or poorly informed, or unreasoned, or non-optimal choices. There is not only the "political uses of (the appearance of) madness." There is "ordinary madness." (Not "clinical" in the individuals.)

Compare: C-I, the Bay of Pigs: the expectation of a general uprising in Cuba as a result of the Bay of Pigs was crazy (for those who held it: a different set, perhaps, from those who predicted it).

Or of low-cost, quickly successful invasion of Cuba (though this was before VN). No plan for guerrilla-war, or sense of what that would mean (either in 1961 or 1962!)

long cake-walk

spread of discovery (of US, in progress...)

the one planned case



JCS hope or belief that JFK would use US forces <sup>K/T</sup> rather than lose, despite his verbal commitment to them (see LBJ in VN) was not crazy: it was even likely; but wrong. But that would have landed us in the soup (of VN) (although, on an island near us). JFK was not wrong, nor LBJ, in resisting.

<sup>yes</sup> Likewise, the expectation of assassination of Castro as a useful element; or of a fake attack on Guantanamo (or a Northwoods-type attack on a US ship: was that contemplated? Perhaps not, given the "provocation" expected of an impending defeat of the US-supported attackers without US intervention (as planned for Mongoose). Was not US intervention seen by the CIA as essential to success, as by <sup>NO</sup> EGL on Mongoose? JFK's ruling that out should have aborted the plan; but they banked on his reversing himself: which he did not do in VN, or, in the end, in Cuba II. None of these were crazy expectations: but they were gambles, arguably long-shots; and they all lost. <sup>g JCS</sup>

It was the overall venture, relying on the first two beliefs, that was crazy (including the belief that it could be covert, with the US hand hidden or deniable).

General rule here: Something may look crazy; and probably is, if it looks that way; **yet** have calculations behind it, including some guesses and reasoning that are both esoteric and not entirely wrong or unrealistic, some unacknowledged motives that are "human," not unusual, some not even discreditable, others discreditable but not uncommon; **yet** to discover these (perhaps long after the events) does not necessarily mean that the effort was not crazy, after all! Highly reasoned and motivated courses by generally reasonable people can be and often are, **crazy**! (See escalation in Vietnam in 1965! And Nixon's strategy!) <sup>long!</sup>

This is not only for the public, voters, Congress to know, as a strong hypothesis. It is for the president to know, confronting allies and opponents! Not only "terrorists." Of course, this possibility is asserted and exploited by those who want large "deterrent, retaliatory" forces; and who also want to use them for extended deterrence (counting on the opponents to know this about the US!)

Yet there are contradictions in their estimates: they assume that the opponent may be mad—yet deterrable (AJW: We want to make FS an act of madness for our opponent; yet we need forces for these that presume considerable madness in the opponent (a mere 20-40 million dead might not deter him: he's almost Hitler, though Hitler probably could not have been deterred at all). Yet (JCS, not AJW): we want him to believe us mad, in NATO (or with FU threats elsewhere), and for him not to be mad enough to test that.

I am going to argue, of course, that the whole 67-year nuclear arms program has been crazy, despite enormous internal calculation on both sides (and hidden partial premises that "make some sense," considered by themselves), crazy in many of its

premises and priorities leading to a continuously crazy result in terms of risks (both possible outcomes and likelihoods and uncertainties), ordinary madness of an extreme though not unprecedented sort, armed with unprecedented weapons foretelling an unprecedented and final outcome.

Ironically, some of the choices made by both JFK and K were less crazy than they appeared to be at the time (though some, unknown till much later, were even crazier, especially by K)—but the predicament they led to, the gambles they were making toward the end, were even worse, more reckless, more dangerous, than either of them knew at the time, nor any one else for



Congress

Oct. 22 11

Willard

VN:

MGB - "another 100K"

JCS - prevail

CBS - etc.

N -

House Economics

Neo-cons / Wall St. / subprime (S+L; banking; dot-com)

Neo-cons: hang - ME

hang

upjohn

- Reader ; 3rd Party 2012

- Doug climate, evolution, old Earth

- 9-11 Spethers

- WWI

- S.B.

- Now and then: STOP FU & Europe



C-4

10-2(-1)

Madison Theory

[all over threats vs. NWS

only of NWS?]

Has been used.

I didn't see

as the basis of FU threats:

Is this 'word' or not?

FU as basis

Can appeal to leaders.

as US policy

in 1958-59:

Can work.

(when nothing else can!)

\* thought it

had to be

May be used against us.

totally bluff:

Missile gap:

" " "

of 'us'

Its risks:

that is legitimized

that is perceived

Commitments are made

(bluff is not revealed

to subordinates, allies)

can be triggered "inadvertently"

may confront "word"/commitment/

mistaken opponent

may explode, be carried out:

and it is word to carry out

(may or may not see word to leaders)

Stingland

X

[Unintentionally: rational actor may not choose to

reveal it, thereby it ("too word" for allies, commitments?)]



C-II

10-21-11

thought the  
concerns  
+ bias about  
a principal  
motive for it

JFK it al were not crazy to believe  
there was no chance K would (or could)  
do what he did —

not to ignore serious means

— It was crazy of K to think he could  
get away with it (without — or with —  
a high chance of blowing up the world) —

— Although he almost did get away  
with it & (at high risk)

JFK it al was  
wrong about this —  
unimaginative

— and he could have <sup>used to create ideas, acts, crises</sup> won, if he had  
done it better, in rather obvious ways:  
• (without much risk of explosion)

— but it had to be done just right —  
the chance this could happen seems low —  
and the risk of uncontrolled actions  
& explosion was greater.

McC... "no risk" — because K & JFK were  
determined as to let it happen — yet they  
allowed uncontrolled actions to persist, of  
which they were aware and could (at a  
cost & effort) have stopped.